arXiv:1301.4105v1 [math.AP] 17 Jan 2013

Continuous dependence estimates for the ergodic problem of Bellman equation with an application to the rate of convergence for the homogenization problem*

Claudio Marchi†

version: January 18, 2013

Abstract

This paper is devoted to establish a continuous dependence estimate for the ergodic problem for Bellman operators (namely an estimate of $\|v_1 - v_2\|_\infty$ where v_1 and v_2 solve two equations with different coefficients) with an explicit dependence on the L^∞-distance between the coefficients and an explicit characterization of the constants.

Afterwards this result will be crucial in the estimate of the rate of convergence for the homogenization of Bellman equations. In some regular cases, we shall obtain the same rate of convergence established in [9, 21] for regular linear problems.

MSC 2000: , 35B27, 35B30, 35J60, 49L25.

Keywords: Continuous dependence estimates, Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equations, viscosity solutions, ergodic problems, homogenization, rate of convergence.

1 Introduction

In this paper we study the continuous dependence estimate for the ergodic problem of (Hamilton-Jacobi-)Bellman operators. This property will be crucial (among others) in the estimate of the rate of convergence for the homogenization problem of such operators.

In the *ergodic problem*, we seek a pair (v, U), with $v \in C(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $U \in \mathbb{R}$ (that is, v is a real-valued function while U is a constant) which, in viscosity sense, satisfies

$$H(x, Dv, D^2v) = U \qquad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \tag{1.1}$$

where the Bellman operator

$$H(x, p, X) = \max_{\alpha \in A} \{-\operatorname{tr}(a(x, \alpha)X) - f(x, \alpha) \cdot p - \ell(x, \alpha)\} \tag{1.2}$$

is uniformly elliptic and periodic in x. (we recall that these operators naturally arise in optimal control problems; see below). This kind of equations have been widely studied in literature, in particular in connection with homogenization or singular perturbation

---

[*] Work partially supported by the INDAM-GNAMPA project "Fenomeni di propagazione su grafi ed in mezzi eterogenei".

[†] Dipartimento di Matematica, Università di Padova, via Trieste 63, 35121 Padova, Italy (`marchi@math.unipd.it`).

problems (see [3, 4, 11, 17] and references therein), with long-time behaviour of solution to parabolic equations (see [4, 8]) with dynamical systems in a torus (see [1, 15]) and with the principal eigenvalue and maximum principle (see [17, 3]). In order to solve problem (1.1), it is expedient to introduce either the *stationary approximated* problems

$$\lambda v^\lambda + H(x, Dv^\lambda, D^2 v^\lambda) = 0 \qquad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \tag{1.3}$$

for any $\lambda \in (0,1)$, or the *evolutive approximated* problem

$$\partial_t V + H(x, DV, D^2V) = 0 \qquad \text{in } (0,+\infty)\times\mathbb{R}^n, \qquad V(0,x) = 0 \qquad \text{on } \mathbb{R}^n. \tag{1.4}$$

It is well known (see [4, 3]) that: (1) there exists exactly one value $U \in \mathbb{R}$ (called *ergodic constant*) such that equation (1.1) admits a periodic solution (which is unique up to a constant); (2) there exist exactly a periodic solution to (1.3) and a x-periodic solution to (1.4); (3) as $\lambda \to 0^+$ (respectively $t \to +\infty$), $-\lambda v^\lambda$ and $v^\lambda - v^\lambda(0)$ (resp., $V(t,x)/t$ and $V(t,x) - Ut$) uniformly converge to U and respectively to a solution v of (1.1).

On the other hand, problems (1.3) and (1.4) naturally arise in stochastic optimal control problem in a periodic medium: consider the control system for $s > 0$

$$dx_s = f(x_s, \alpha_s)ds + \sqrt{2}\sigma(x_s,\alpha_s)dW_s, \qquad x_0 = x$$

where $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{P})$ is a probability space endowed with a right continuous filtration $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{0\le t<+\infty}$ and a p-dimensional Brownian motion W_t. The control α is chosen in the set $\mathcal{A}$ of progressively measurable processes with value in the compact set A for minimizing the *cost*

$$P(x,\alpha) := \mathbb{E}_x \int_0^{+\infty} \ell(x_s,\alpha_s)e^{-\lambda s}ds, \qquad (\text{resp., } P(t,x,\alpha) := \mathbb{E}_x \int_0^t \ell(x_s,\alpha_s)ds)$$

where $\mathbb{E}_x$ denotes the expectation. Then, the value function $v^\lambda(x) := \inf_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}} P(x,\alpha)$ (resp., $V(t,x) := \inf_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}} P(t,x,\alpha)$) solves (1.3) (resp., (1.4)) with $a = \sigma\sigma^T$. We deduce that the ergodic constant and a solution to (1.1) can be written as (for some $c_0 \in \mathbb{R}$)

$$\begin{aligned} U &= \lim_{\lambda\to 0^+} \lambda \inf_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}} \mathbb{E}_x \textstyle\int_0^{+\infty} \ell(x_s,\alpha_s)e^{-\lambda s}ds = \lim_{t\to+\infty} \frac{1}{t} \inf_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}} \mathbb{E}_x \int_0^t \ell(x_s,\alpha_s)ds \\ v &= \lim_{\lambda\to 0^+} \lambda \left[\inf_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}} P(x,\alpha) - \inf_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}} P(x,\alpha)\right] = \lim_{t\to+\infty} \left[\inf_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}} P(t,x,\alpha) - Ut\right] + c_0. \end{aligned}$$

In this paper, we tackle the continuous dependence estimate for the solution v to (1.1) with $v(0) = 0$ namely, an estimate of $\|v_1 - v_2\|_\infty$, where v_1 and v_2 are solutions to two equations (1.1) with different coefficients. The additional requirement $v(0) = 0$ is needed to avoid the non-uniqueness of v. We recall that the continuous dependence estimate for the ergodic constant has been established in [2] (see [23] and [3] respectively for a generalization to Bellman-Isaacs operators and to some degenerate elliptic cases). Let us recall that such estimates have been widely studied because they play a crucial role in many contexts as error estimates for approximation schemes (see [7, 16] and references therein), regularity results (for instance, see [6, 20]) and rate of convergence for vanishing viscosity methods (see [19, 20] and references therein). Unfortunately, the previous literature does not apply to (1.1); indeed, as far as we know, all the papers consider either elliptic equations with a strictly positive coefficient of the 0-th order term or parabolic equations where the constant entering in the estimate diverges as $t \to +\infty$. In other words, these results apply to (1.3) or to (1.4) but the estimates would diverge as $\lambda \to 0^+$ or $t \to +\infty$. Finally, for a diffusion matrix left unchanged, the continuous dependence estimate for the v is ascertained in [12].

In the second part of the paper, we shall study the rate of convergence for the homogenization of Bellman equations. Consider the problem

$$u^\varepsilon + H\left(x, \frac{x}{\varepsilon}, Du^\varepsilon, D^2u^\varepsilon\right) = 0 \qquad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n, \tag{1.5}$$

where H has the form (1.2) and its coefficients depend on $(x, x/\varepsilon, \alpha)$ and are x/ε-periodic. It is well known (see [2, 17]), that as $\varepsilon \to 0^+$, the solution u^ε converges locally uniformly to the solution of the *effective* problem

$$u + \overline{H}\left(x, Du, D^2u\right) = 0 \qquad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n$$

where the value $\overline{H}(x, p, X)$ is characterized as the ergodic constant for a suitable Hamiltonian (see Section 3 for details). This feature is formally motivated by the the expansion (which goes back to the homogenization theory for linear equations; see [9, 21])

$$u^\varepsilon(x) = u(x) + \varepsilon v(x, x/\varepsilon) + \varepsilon^2 w(x, x/\varepsilon) + \dots. \tag{1.6}$$

In the framework of fully nonlinear equations, the study of the rate of convergence for the homogenization problem (namely, an estimate of $\|u-u^\varepsilon\|_\infty$) started with the paper [14] for first order problems (for the linear case: see [9, 21] for the periodic environment and [26] for the random one). Camilli and the author [13] tackled this issue for the homogenization of Bellman problem (1.5). Taking advantage of the $C^{2,\theta}$-regularity of u, they proved that u^ε converges to u with a rate of order $2\theta/(2+\theta)$, namely $\|u - u^\varepsilon\|_\infty \leq C\varepsilon^{2\theta/(2+\theta)}$. It is worth to recall that Caffarelli and Souganidis [10] obtained a rate of order $|\ln \varepsilon|^{-1/2}$ for the homogenization of possibly nonconvex Hamiltonians in random media.

In this paper, we shall improve the result of [13] obtaining a rate of order θ. Let us stress that, for $\theta = 1$, our estimate has the same order as the "natural" one given by the formal expansion (1.6) and also as the regular case for linear problem as stated in the monographs by Bensoussan, J.L. Lions and Papanicolaou [9, pag. 76] and by Jikov, Kozlov and Oleinik [21, pag. 30].

In conclusion, this paper is devoted to two main purposes. The former is to establish a continuous dependence estimate for the solution v to (1.1)-(1.2) with an explicit dependence on the $\mathbb{L}^\infty$-distance between the coefficients and an explicit characterization of the constants. The latter is to establish an estimate of the rate of convergence for the homogenization problem (1.5) that generalizes to Bellman operators the estimate given in the monographs [9, 21] for linear ones.

This paper is organized as follows: in the rest of this Section we set some notations. Section 2 is devoted to the continuous dependence estimate for the ergodic problem. Section 3 concerns the rate of convergence for the homogenization problem.

Notations: We define $\mathbb{M}^{n,p}$ and $\mathbb{S}^n$ respectively as the set of $n\times p$ real matrices and the set of $n \times n$ real symmetric matrices. The latter is endowed with the *euclidean* norm and with the usual order, namely: for $X = (X_{ij})_{i,j=1,\dots,n} \in \mathbb{S}^n$, $|X| := \left(\sum_{i,j=1}^n X_{ij}^2\right)^{1/2} \equiv \operatorname{tr}({}^TAA)$ and, for $X, Y \in \mathbb{S}^n$, we shall write $X \geq Y$, if $X - Y$ is a semi-definite positive matrix. We denote I the identity matrix in $\mathbb{S}^n$.

For every real-valued function h, we set $\|h\|_\infty := \operatorname{ess\,sup} |h(y)|$. For $\theta \in (0, 1]$, we use the θ-Hölder seminorm: $[h]_\theta := \sup_{y\neq x} \frac{|h(y)-h(x)|}{|y-x|^\theta}$. $C^\theta(\mathbb{R}^n)$ denotes the space of functions h such that: $\|h\|_\infty + [h]_\theta < +\infty$ while, for $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $C^{m,\theta}$ stands for the space of functions whose derivatives of order m belong to $C^\theta(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

2 Continuous dependence estimate for the ergodic problem

This Section is devoted to obtain an estimate of $\|v_1 - v_2\|_\infty$ where, for $i = 1, 2$, v_i is the solution to the following ergodic problem

$$\max_{\alpha\in A} \left\{ -\operatorname{tr}\left(a_i(x,\alpha)D^2 v_i\right) - f_i(x,\alpha)\cdot Dv_i - \ell_i(x,\alpha)\right\} = U_i \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n, \quad v_i(0) = 0. \tag{Ei}$$

We shall assume

(A1) A is a compact metric space;

(A2) for $\sigma_i(x,\alpha) \in \mathbb{M}^{n,p}$, $a_i = \sigma_i\sigma_i^T$ is *uniformly elliptic*: for some $\nu > 0$, there holds $a(x,\alpha) \geq \nu I$, $\forall (x,\alpha) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times A$;

(A3) the functions a_i, f_i and ℓ_i are $\mathbb{Z}^n$-periodic in x; moreover, they are bounded and Lipschitz continuous in x uniformly in α, namely, for $\phi = a_i, f_i, \ell_i$, there holds

$$\|\phi\|_\infty \leq K_\phi, \qquad |\phi(x,\alpha) - \phi(y,\alpha)| \leq L_\phi|x-y| \quad \forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n,\ \alpha \in A.$$

In order to study problem (Ei), it is expedient to introduce the approximate equations for $\lambda \in (0,1)$

$$\lambda v_i^\lambda + \max_{\alpha\in A} \left\{ -\operatorname{tr}\left(a_i(x,\alpha)D^2 v_i^\lambda\right) - f_i(x,\alpha)\cdot v_i^\lambda - \ell_i(x,\alpha)\right\} = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n. \tag{Ai}$$

In the next Proposition, we shall establish some useful properties of problems (Ei) and (Ai); since most of them are yet known in literature, we shall postpone the proof at the end of the Section.

Proposition 2.1 *The following properties hold*

(i) There exists exactly one periodic solution to (Ai) *with* $\|\lambda v_i^\lambda\|_\infty \leq K_{\ell_i}$.

(ii) For some constant $\theta \in (0,1]$ *depending only on* n *and* ν, *there holds*

$$\|v_i^\lambda - v_i^\lambda(0)\|_{C^{2,\theta}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C_1(1 + K_{\ell_i} + L_{\ell_i}) \qquad \forall \lambda \in (0,1)$$

where C_1 *is a constant independent of* λ, K_{ℓ_i} *and* L_{ℓ_i}.

(iii) As $\lambda \to 0^+$, *the sequence* $\{\lambda v_i^\lambda\}_\lambda$ *uniformly converges to a value* $-U_i$; *moreover,* U_i *is the unique constant such that the problem* (Ei) *admits a periodic solution.*

(iv) As $\lambda \to 0^+$, *the sequence* $\{v_i^\lambda - v_i^\lambda(0)\}_\lambda$ *uniformly converges to the unique solution to* (Ei).

Let us now establish our main result on the continuous dependence estimate for problem (Ei).

Theorem 2.1 *Let* v_i *be the unique solution to problem* (Ei) *(*$i = 1, 2$*). Then, there holds*

$$\|v_1 - v_2\|_\infty \leq CC_\ell \left(\max_{x,\alpha} |a_1 - a_2| + \max_{x,\alpha} |f_1 - f_2| \right) + C \max_{x,\alpha} |\ell_1 - \ell_2|$$

where $C_\ell := 1 + (K_{\ell_1} + L_{\ell_1}) \wedge (K_{\ell_2} + L_{\ell_2})$ *while* C *is a constant independent of* K_{ℓ_i} *and* L_{ℓ_i}.

Proof of Theorem 2.1 For $i = 1, 2$, let v_i^λ be the solution to the approximated problem (Ai); set $w_i^\lambda := v_i^\lambda - v_i^\lambda(0)$. By Proposition 2.1-(*iv*), it suffices to establish

$$\|w_1^\lambda - w_2^\lambda\|_\infty \leq CC_\ell \left(\max_{x,\alpha}|a_1 - a_2| + \max_{x,\alpha}|f_1 - f_2|\right) + C\max_{x,\alpha}|\ell_1 - \ell_2| \qquad \forall\lambda \in (0,1) \quad (2.1)$$

where C is a constant depending only on K_{a_i}, L_{a_i}, K_{f_i}, L_{f_i}, n and ν (i.e., it is independent of K_{ℓ_i}, L_{ℓ_i} and λ).

Let us claim that, for every $\lambda \in (0,1)$, there holds

$$\lambda\|v_1^\lambda - v_2^\lambda\|_\infty \leq C_1C_\ell \left(\max_{x,\alpha}|a_1 - a_2| + \max_{x,\alpha}|f_1 - f_2|\right) + \max_{x,\alpha}|\ell_1 - \ell_2|, \qquad (2.2)$$

where C_1 and C_ℓ are the constants introduced respectively in Proposition 2.1-(*ii*) and in the statement. Indeed, assume wlog $K_{\ell_1} + L_{\ell_1} \geq K_{\ell_2} + L_{\ell_2}$; one can easily check that the functions

$$v^\pm := v_2^\lambda \pm \lambda^{-1}C_1C_\ell \left(\max_{x,\alpha}|a_1 - a_2| + \max_{x,\alpha}|f_1 - f_2|\right) + \lambda^{-1}\max_{x,\alpha}|\ell_1 - \ell_2|$$

are respectively a super- and a subsolution to problem (Ai) with $i = 1$. The comparison principle guarantees $v^- \leq v_1^\lambda \leq v^+$ which is equivalent to (2.2).

In order to prove inequality (2.1), we shall proceed by contradiction assuming that, for $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $i = 1, 2$, there exist λ_k, a_{ik}, f_{ik} and ℓ_{ik} such that

-) $\lambda_k \to 0$ as $k \to +\infty$,

-) a_{ik} and f_{ik} satisfy $(A2)$-$(A3)$ with the same constants ν, K_a, L_a, K_f and L_f,

-) $c_k := \|w_1^{\lambda_k} - w_2^{\lambda_k}\|_\infty \geq k[C_k(\max|a_1 - a_2| + \max|f_1 - f_2|) + \max|\ell_1 - \ell_2|]$

where $C_k := 1 + (K_{\ell_{1k}} + L_{\ell_{1k}}) \wedge (K_{\ell_{2k}} + L_{\ell_{2k}})$, $w_i^{\lambda_k} := v_i^{\lambda_k} - v_i^{\lambda_k}(0)$ and $v_i^{\lambda_k}$ is the solution to problem (Ai) with λ, a, f and ℓ replaced rispectively by λ_k, a_{ik}, f_{ik} and ℓ_{ik}. Without any loss of generality, we assume $K_{\ell_{1k}} + L_{\ell_{1k}} \geq K_{\ell_{2k}} + L_{\ell_{2k}}$ for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$; we observe that the function $\tilde{w}^k := w_1^{\lambda_k} - w_2^{\lambda_k}$ solves

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda_k\tilde{w}^k + \lambda_k\left(v_1^{\lambda_k}(0) - v_2^{\lambda_k}(0)\right) + \max_{\alpha\in A}\left\{-\operatorname{tr}(a_{1k}D^2\tilde{w}^k) - f_{1k}\cdot D\tilde{w}^k\right\}\\ + \max_{\alpha\in A}\left\{\operatorname{tr}[(a_{2k} - a_{1k})D^2w_2^{\lambda_k}] + (f_{2k} - f_{1k})\cdot Dw_2^{\lambda_k} + \ell_{2k} - \ell_{1k}\right\} \geq 0.\end{aligned}$$

In particular, the function $w_k := \tilde{w}^k/c_k \equiv \tilde{w}^k/\|\tilde{w}^k\|_\infty$ fulfills

$$\begin{aligned}H_k(x, Dw_k, D^2w_k) + \lambda_kw_k + c_k^{-1}\lambda_k\left(v_1^{\lambda_k}(0) - v_2^{\lambda_k}(0)\right)\\ + c_k^{-1}\max_{\alpha\in A}\left\{\operatorname{tr}[(a_{2k} - a_{1k})D^2w_2^{\lambda_k}] + (f_{2k} - f_{1k})\cdot Dw_2^{\lambda_k} + \ell_{2k} - \ell_{1k}\right\} \geq 0,\end{aligned}$$

with

$$H_k(x,p,X) = \max_{\alpha\in A}\left\{-\operatorname{tr}(a_{1k}(x,\alpha)X) - f_{1k}(x,\alpha)\cdot p\right\}.$$

Since $\|w_k\|_\infty = 1$, by (2.2) and the definition of c_k, we infer

$$\lambda_kw_k + c_k^{-1}\lambda_k\left(v_1^{\lambda_k}(0) - v_2^{\lambda_k}(0)\right) = o(1) \qquad \text{as } k \to +\infty.$$

Moreover, owing to Proposition 2.1-(*ii*) and to our definition of c_k we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&c_k^{-1}\left|\max_{\alpha\in A}\left\{\operatorname{tr}[(a_{2k}-a_{1k})D^2w_2^{\lambda_k}]+(f_{2k}-f_{1k})\cdot Dw_2^{\lambda_k}+\ell_{2k}-\ell_{1k}\right\}\right|\\
&\quad\le c_k^{-1}\left(\max_{x,\alpha}|a_{1k}-a_{2k}|\|D^2w_2^{\lambda_k}\|_\infty+\max_{x,\alpha}|f_{1k}-f_{2k}|\|Dw_2^{\lambda_k}\|_\infty+\max_{x,\alpha}|\ell_{1k}-\ell_{2k}|\right)\\
&\quad\le c_k^{-1}\left[C_1(1+K_{\ell_{2k}}+L_{\ell_{2k}})\left(\max_{x,\alpha}|a_{1k}-a_{2k}|+\max_{x,\alpha}|f_{1k}-f_{2k}|\right)+\max_{x,\alpha}|\ell_{1k}-\ell_{2k}|\right]\\
&\quad\le o(1)\qquad\text{as } k\to+\infty.
\end{aligned}$$

Taking into account the last three relations, we obtain

$$H_k(x,Dw_k,D^2w_k)\ge o(1). \tag{2.3}$$

We note that H_k fulfills the following properties for every (x,p,X) and k

$$\begin{aligned}
|H_k(x,p,X)|&\le K_a|X|+K_f|p|\\
|H_k(x_1,p_1,X_1)-H_k(x_2,p_2,X_2)|&\le K_a|X_1-X_2|+K_f|p_1-p_2|\\
&\qquad+[L_a(|X_1|\wedge|X_2|)+L_f(|p_1|\wedge|p_2|)]|x_1-x_2|.
\end{aligned}$$

By Ascoli Theorem, we can assume that, as $k\to+\infty$, H_k converge to some operator $\tilde H$ locally uniformly in $\mathbb{R}^n\times\mathbb{R}^n\times\mathbb{S}^n$; moreover, $\tilde H$ is uniformly elliptic. On the other hand, since $\|w_k\|_\infty=1$, by standard regularity theory for elliptic equations (see [25]), the functions w_k are uniformly Hölder continuous; whence, again by the Ascoli Theorem, we can assume that w_k converge to some continuous periodic function w uniformly in $\mathbb{R}^n$. Finally, passing to the limit in (2.3), the stability result for viscosity solution entails that w is a solution to

$$\tilde H(x,Dw,D^2w)\ge 0.$$

We note that w also verifies: $\|w\|_\infty=1$, and $w(0)=0$; thus, it attains its global minimum. This fact contradicts the maximum principle (see: [25, 5]); the proof of (2.1) is accomplished. □

PROOF OF PROPOSITION 2.1 For the detailed proof, we refer the reader to [4, Theorem II.2] and to [2, Proposition 12] (see also [3, Theorem 4.1] for similar results for Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman-Isaacs operators). Let us just discuss the proof of point (*ii*) and, especially, its right hand side which seems to be new in this form. For the sake of simplicity, we shall drop the subscript *"i"*. We claim that there exists a constant C_1', enjoying the same properties of C_1 (i.e., independent of λ, K_ℓ and L_ℓ) such that

$$\|v^\lambda-v^\lambda(0)\|_\infty\le C_1'(1+K_\ell)\qquad\forall\lambda\in(0,1). \tag{2.4}$$

In order to prove this relation, we proceed by contradiction assuming that, for $k\in\mathbb{N}$, there exist λ_k, a_k, f_k and ℓ_k, fulfilling ($A1$)-($A3$) with the same constants K_a, L_a, K_f and L_f, such that $\lambda_k\to 0$ as $k\to+\infty$ and

$$\|v_{\lambda_k}-v_{\lambda_k}(0)\|_\infty\ge k(1+K_{\ell_k})\qquad\forall k\in\mathbb{N} \tag{2.5}$$

where v_{λ_k} is the solution to (Ai) with λ, a_i, f_i and ℓ_i replaced respectively by λ_k, a_k, f_k and ℓ_k.

For $\eta_k := \|v_{\lambda_k} - v_{\lambda_k}(0)\|_\infty$, set $v^k := \eta_k^{-1}(v_{\lambda_k} - v_{\lambda_k}(0))$. We note that there holds

$$\lambda_k v^k + \eta_k^{-1}\lambda_k v_{\lambda_k}(0) + \max_\alpha \left\{-\operatorname{tr}\left(a_k D^2 v^k\right) - f_k \cdot Dv^k - \eta_k^{-1}\ell_k\right\} = 0;$$

in particular, for any $\alpha_0 \in A$ fixed, we obtain

$$\lambda_k v^k + \lambda_k \eta_k^{-1} v_{\lambda_k}(0) - \operatorname{tr}\left(a_k(\cdot, \alpha_0) D^2 v^k\right) - f_k(\cdot, \alpha_0) \cdot Dv^k - \eta_k^{-1}\ell_k(\cdot, \alpha_0) \le 0.$$

We have $\|v^k\|_\infty = 1$; moreover, by standard regularity theory for HJB equations (see [18, 24]), the functions v^k are equi-Lipschitz continuous. Without any loss of generality, we can assume that v^k uniformly converges to some periodic function $\tilde v$ with $\tilde v(0) = 0$ and $\|\tilde v\|_\infty = 1$. On the other hand, by $(A3)$, (eventually passing to subsequence) $a_k(\cdot, \alpha_0)$ and $f_k(\cdot, \alpha_0)$ are uniformly convergent respectively to some $\tilde a$ and $\tilde f$. Letting $k \to +\infty$ in the previous inequality, by point (i) and relation (2.5), the stability result of viscosity solutions ensures: $-\operatorname{tr}\left(\tilde a D^2 \tilde v\right) - \tilde f \cdot D\tilde v \le 0$. By the maximum principle (see [25, 5]), $\tilde v$ cannot attain its maximum; this property contradicts the fact that $\tilde v$ is periodic with $\tilde v(0) = 0$ and $\|\tilde v\|_\infty = 1$. hence, our claim (2.4) is established.

Finally, invoking [24, Theorem 1.1], for some $\theta \in (0, 1]$ depending on n and ν and for some constant C_1'' enjoying the same properties of C_1, we get

$$\|v^\lambda - v^\lambda(0)\|_{C^{2,\theta}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \le C_1'' \left(C_1'(1 + K_\ell) + L_\ell\right)$$

which amounts to our statement. □

3 Rate of convergence for the homogenization problem

We consider the following homogenization problem

$$u^\varepsilon + H\left(x, \frac{x}{\varepsilon}, Du^\varepsilon, D^2u^\varepsilon\right) = 0 \qquad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \tag{3.1}$$

with

$$H(x, y, p, X) = \max_{\alpha \in A}\left\{-\operatorname{tr}\left(a(x, y, \alpha)X\right) - f(x, y, \alpha) \cdot p - \ell(x, y, \alpha)\right\}. \tag{3.2}$$

Throughout this Section, the following assumptions will hold

- (H1) A is a compact metric space;
- (H2) for $\sigma(x, y, \alpha) \in \mathbb{M}^{n,p}$, $a = \sigma\sigma^T$ is uniformly elliptic: for some $\nu > 0$, there holds $a(x, y, \alpha) \ge \nu I$, $\forall (x, y, \alpha) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \times A$;
- (H3) the functions a, f and ℓ are $\mathbb{Z}^n$-periodic in y; moreover, they are bounded and Lipschitz continuous in (x, y) uniformly in α: for $\phi = a, f, \ell$, there holds $\|\phi\|_\infty \le K$ and

$$|\phi(x_1, y_1, \alpha) - \phi(x_2, y_2, \alpha)| \le L(|x_1 - x_2| + |y_1 - y_2|) \quad \forall x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n, \alpha \in A.$$

Let us recall that equation (3.1) arises, for instance, in stochastic optimal control problem in a medium with miscroscopic periodic heterogeneities. Actually, consider the dynamics

$$dx_s = f(x_s, x_s/\varepsilon, \alpha_s)ds + \sqrt{2}\sigma(x_s, x_s/\varepsilon, \alpha_s)dW_s, \qquad x_0 = x$$

in the probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{P})$ with a right continuous filtration $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{0\le t<+\infty}$ and a p-dimensional Brownian motion W_t. It is well known that there holds

$$u^\varepsilon(x) := \inf_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}} \mathbb{E}_x \int_0^{+\infty} \ell(x_s, x_s/\varepsilon, \alpha_s)e^{-s}ds$$

where $\mathcal{A}$ stands for the set of progressively measurable processes with value in A. The aim of homogenization is to investigate the behaviour of the optimal control problem as the heterogeneities become smaller and smaller. In literature (see [17, 2, 3]) it is well known that the limit function $u := \lim_{\varepsilon\to 0^+} u^\varepsilon$ can be characterized as the solution of a suitable problem (the *effective problem*). This Section is devoted to establish an estimate of $\|u^\varepsilon - u\|_\infty$.

As in [17, 2, 3], we introduce the *effective* operator $\overline{H}$ as follows: for every $(\overline{x}, \overline{p}, \overline{X}) \in \mathbb{R}^n\times\mathbb{R}^n\times\mathbb{S}^n$ fixed, the value $\overline{H}(\overline{x}, \overline{p}, \overline{X})$ is the ergodic constant for $H(\overline{x}, \cdot, \overline{p}, \overline{X}+\cdot)$, namely it is the unique constant such that there exists a solution to the *cell problem*

$$H(\overline{x}, y, \overline{p}, \overline{X} + D^2v) = \overline{H}(\overline{x}, \overline{p}, \overline{X}). \tag{3.3}$$

The effective problem is

$$u + \overline{H}\left(x, Du, D^2u\right) = 0 \qquad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n. \tag{3.4}$$

In the next two statement we shall collect some properties of problems (3.1) and (3.4) and respectively of their solutions. We shall omit the proofs: the proof of the former can be found in [2, Proposition 12] and in [17, Lemma 3.2] (see also [13, Lemma 2.2]). The proof of the latter is an easy consequence of the previous one and of the regularity theory for uniformly elliptic convex operators (see [24, Theorem 1.1]).

Lemma 3.1 *The effective operator $\overline{H}$ is convex in X and uniformly elliptic with the same ellipticity constant ν as in $(H2)$. Moreover, there exists a constant $\overline{C}$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned}|\overline{H}(x_1, p_1, X_1) - \overline{H}(x_2, p_2, X_2)| \le \overline{C}(1 + |p_1| \wedge |p_2| + |X_1| \wedge |X_2|)|x_1 - x_2| \\ + \overline{C}(|p_1 - p_2| + |X_1 - X_2|).\end{aligned}$$

Hence the comparison principle also holds for problem (3.4).

Lemma 3.2 *The problems* (3.1) *and* (3.4) *admit exactly one viscosity solution u^ε and respectively u. Moreover, there exist $N > 0$ and $\theta \in (0, 1]$ such that*

$$\|u^\varepsilon\|_\infty \le N, \quad \|u\|_\infty \le N, \quad \|Du\|_\infty \le N, \quad \|D^2u\|_{C^{2,\theta}(B(x,1))} \le N \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Let us now establish our main result on the rate of convergence for the homogenization problem (3.1).

Theorem 3.1 *Let u^ε and u be respectively the solution to problems* (3.1) *and* (3.4)*. Then, there exists a constant M such that*

$$\|u^\varepsilon - u\|_\infty \le M\varepsilon^\theta \qquad \forall\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$$

where $\theta \in (0, 1]$ is the constant introduced in Lemma 3.2.

PROOF OF THEOREM 3.1 We shall proceed using some techniques introduced in [13, Theorem 2.1]. We shall denote $v(\cdot;\overline{x},\overline{p},\overline{X})$ the unique solution to (3.3) with $v(0,\overline{x},\overline{p},\overline{X}) = 0$ so as to display its dependence on the fixed parameters. In the following statement, we collect some regularity properties of v.

Lemma 3.3 *There exist $\theta \in (0,1]$ and a constant C_2 such that*

$$\begin{aligned} (i) \qquad & \|v(\cdot;x_1,p_1,X_1)\|_{C^{2,\theta}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C_2(1+|p_1|+|X_1|),\\ (ii) \qquad & \|v(\cdot;x_1,p_1,X_1)-v(\cdot;x_2,p_2,X_2)\|_\infty \leq C_2(|p_1-p_2|+|X_1-X_2|)\\ & \qquad + C_2[1+(|p_1|+|X_1|)\wedge(|p_2|+|X_2|)]|x_1-x_2|, \end{aligned}$$

for every $x_1,x_2,p_1,p_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $X_1,X_2 \in \mathbb{S}^n$.

PROOF OF LEMMA 3.3 We note that equation (3.3) fulfills assumptions $(A1)$-$(A4)$ with constants $K_a = K_f = K$, $L_a = L_f = L$, $K_\ell = K(1+|\overline{p}|+|\overline{X}|)$ and $L_\ell = L(1+|\overline{p}|+|\overline{X}|)$. Whence, point (i) is due to Proposition 2.1-(ii) and -(iv).

In order to ascertain point (ii), it suffices to apply Theorem 2.1 with the variable x replaced by y, and (for $i=1,2$)

$$\begin{aligned} a_i(\cdot,\alpha) &:= a(x_i,\cdot,\alpha), \qquad f_i(\cdot,\alpha) := f(x_i,\cdot,\alpha),\\ \ell_i(\cdot,\alpha) &:= \ell(x_i,\cdot,\alpha) + \mathrm{tr}(a(x_i,\cdot,\alpha)X_i) + f(x_i,\cdot,\alpha)\cdot p_i. \end{aligned}$$

Taking into account the bounds

$$\begin{aligned} \max|a_1-a_2| \leq L|x_1-x_2|, \qquad \max|f_1-f_2| \leq L|x_1-x_2|,\\ \max|\ell_1-\ell_2| \leq K(|X_1-X_2|+|p_1-p_2|) + L(1+|p_1|\wedge|p_2|+|X_1|\wedge|X_2|)|x_1-x_2|, \end{aligned}$$

by Theorem 2.1, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|v(\cdot;x_1,p_1,X_1)-v(\cdot;x_2,p_2,X_2)\|_\infty \leq 2CC_\ell L|x_1-x_2| + CK(|X_1-X_2|+|p_1-p_2|)\\ + CL(1+|p_1|\wedge|p_2|+|X_1|\wedge|X_2|)|x_1-x_2|. \end{aligned}$$

Taking into account the inequality $C_\ell \leq (K+L+1)[1+(|p_1|+|X_1|)\wedge(|p_2|+|X_2|)]$, we accomplish the proof. □

Let us come back to the proof of Theorem 3.1. Fix $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$ and, for each $\gamma \in (0,1)$, introduce the function

$$\phi(x) := u^\varepsilon(x) - u(x) - \varepsilon^2 v\left(\frac{x}{\varepsilon};[u](x)\right) - \frac{\gamma}{2}|x|^2 \tag{3.5}$$

where $v(y;[u](x)) := v(y;x,Du(x),D^2u(x))$. Taking into account the bounds in Lemma 3.3-(i) and in Lemma 3.2, the functions u^ε, u and $v(\cdot/\varepsilon;[u](\cdot))$ are bounded; whence there exists a point $\hat{x}$ where the function ϕ attains its maximum.

Set $c := 4C_2(1+2N)\varepsilon^\theta$ (where C_2, N and θ are the constants introduced respectively in Lemma 3.3 and in Lemma 3.2) and introduce the function

$$\tilde{\phi}(x) := u^\varepsilon(x) - u(x) - \varepsilon^2 v\left(\frac{x}{\varepsilon};[u](\hat{x})\right) - \frac{\gamma}{2}|x|^2 - c|x-\hat{x}|^2. \tag{3.6}$$

The function $\tilde{\phi}$ verifies $\tilde{\phi}(\hat{x}) = \phi(\hat{x})$ and also, owing to Lemma 3.3-(ii) and Lemma 3.2,

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\phi}(\hat{x}) - \tilde{\phi}(x) &\geq -\varepsilon^2 \left[v(x/\varepsilon; [u](x)) - v(x/\varepsilon; [u](\hat{x}))\right] + c\varepsilon^2 \\ &\geq -C_2[2N\varepsilon^\theta + (1 + \|Du\|_\infty + \|D^2u\|_\infty)\varepsilon]\varepsilon^2 + 4C_2(1+2N)\varepsilon^{2+\theta} > 0\end{aligned}$$

for every $x \in \partial B(\hat{x}, \varepsilon)$. Therefore, $\tilde{\phi}$ attains a maximum in some point $\tilde{x} \in B(\hat{x}, \varepsilon)$. Let us prove that there exists a constant $M_1 > 0$ (independent of ε and γ) such that

$$\gamma^{1/2}|\tilde{x}| \leq M_1. \tag{3.7}$$

Actually, owing to Lemma 3.2 and Lemma 3.3-(i), inequality $\phi(\hat{x}) \geq \phi(0)$ gives

$$\frac{\gamma}{2}|\hat{x}|^2 \leq 4N + 2C_2(1+2N)\varepsilon^2.$$

For M_1 sufficiently large, we obtain: $\gamma^{1/2}|\hat{x}| \leq M_1/2$; in particular, we deduce

$$\gamma|\tilde{x}| \leq \gamma|\hat{x}| + \gamma|\tilde{x} - \hat{x}| \leq \gamma^{1/2}M_1/2 + \gamma\varepsilon \leq \gamma^{1/2}M_1$$

that is our claim (3.7).

We claim now that there exists a constant M_2 (independent of ε and γ) such that

$$u^\varepsilon(\tilde{x}) - u(\hat{x}) \leq M_2 \left[\varepsilon^\theta + \gamma^{1/2}\right]. \tag{3.8}$$

In order to prove this bound, we recall that the function u^ε solves problem (3.1) and that

$$x \mapsto u^\varepsilon(x) - [u(x) + \varepsilon^2 v(x; [u](\hat{x})) + \gamma|x|^2/2 + c|x - \hat{x}|^2]$$

attains a maximum in $\tilde{x}$. Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned}0 \geq u^\varepsilon(\tilde{x}) + H\,(\tilde{x}, \tilde{x}/\varepsilon, Du(\tilde{x}) + \varepsilon D_y v(\tilde{x}/\varepsilon; [u](\hat{x})) + \gamma\tilde{x} + 2c(\tilde{x} - \hat{x}),& \\ D^2u(\tilde{x}) + D_y^2 v(\tilde{x}/\varepsilon; [u](\hat{x})) + (\gamma + 2c)I\big)&.\end{aligned}$$

Assumptions ($H1$)-($H4$), relation (3.7), Lemma 3.2 and Lemma 3.3-(i) guarantee

$$\begin{aligned}&H\left(\tilde{x}, \tilde{x}/\varepsilon, Du(\tilde{x}) + \varepsilon D_y v(\tilde{x}/\varepsilon; [u](\hat{x})) + \gamma\tilde{x} + 2c(\tilde{x} - \hat{x}), D^2u(\tilde{x}) + \right. \\ &\qquad\qquad\left. + D_y^2 v(\tilde{x}/\varepsilon; [u](\hat{x})) + (\gamma + 2c)I\right) \\ &\quad\geq H\left(\tilde{x}, \tilde{x}/\varepsilon, Du(\tilde{x}), D^2u(\tilde{x}) + D_y^2 v(\tilde{x}/\varepsilon; [u](\hat{x}))\right) - \\ &\qquad\qquad - K\left[\varepsilon C_2(1+2N) + \gamma^{1/2}M_1 + 2c\varepsilon + \gamma + 2c\right] \\ &\quad\geq H\left(\hat{x}, \tilde{x}/\varepsilon, Du(\hat{x}), D^2u(\hat{x}) + D_y^2 v(\tilde{x}/\varepsilon; [u](\hat{x}))\right) - M_2\left[\varepsilon^\theta + \gamma^{1/2}\right]\end{aligned}$$

for some constant M_2 independent of ε and γ. Moreover, the cell problem (3.3) and the effective one (3.4) entail

$$H\left(\hat{x}, \tilde{x}/\varepsilon, Du(\hat{x}), D^2u(\hat{x}) + D_y^2 v(\tilde{x}/\varepsilon; [u](\hat{x}))\right) = \overline{H}(\hat{x}, Du(\hat{x}), D^2u(\hat{x})) = -u(\hat{x}).$$

Substituting the last two relations in the previous one, we accomplish the proof of our claim (3.8).

Finally, for every $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, the inequalities $\tilde{\phi}(\tilde{x}) \geq \tilde{\phi}(\hat{x}) = \phi(\hat{x}) \geq \phi(x)$ give

$$\begin{aligned} u^\varepsilon(x) - u(x) &\leq [u^\varepsilon(\tilde{x}) - u(\hat{x})] + [u(\hat{x}) - u(\tilde{x})] + \\ &\qquad \varepsilon^2 \left[v(x/\varepsilon; [u](x)) - v(\tilde{x}/\varepsilon; [u](\hat{x}))\right] + \frac{\gamma}{2}|x|^2 \\ &\leq M_2 \left[\varepsilon^\theta + \gamma^{1/2}\right] + N\varepsilon + 2C_2(1+2N)\varepsilon^2 + \frac{\gamma}{2}|x|^2 \end{aligned}$$

where the latter inequality is due to relations (3.8), to Lemma 3.2 and to Lemma 3.3-(i). Letting $\gamma \to 0^+$ (eventually increasing M_2), we deduce

$$u^\varepsilon(x) - u(x) \leq M_2 \varepsilon^\theta$$

hence, we accomplished the proof of one inequality of the statement. Being similar, the proof of the other one is omitted. □

Example Consider a diffusion coefficient $a = a(x)$ with $a \in C^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Problem (3.4) is

$$u^\varepsilon + \mathrm{tr}(a(x)D^2u^\varepsilon) + F_1\left(x, \frac{x}{\varepsilon}, Du^\varepsilon\right) = 0 \tag{3.9}$$

where $F_1(x,y,p) := \max_{\alpha \in A}\{-f(x,y,\alpha)\cdot p - l(x,y,\alpha)\}$. Invoking [3, Corollary 3.2], we have that the effective equation can be written as

$$u + \mathrm{tr}(a(x)D^2u^\varepsilon) + \bar{F}_1(x, Du) = 0$$

where $\bar{F}_1(x,p) := \int_{(0,1]^n} F_1(x,y,p)\,dy$. The regularity theory for semilinear equation (see [22]) ensures that the effective solution u belongs to $C^{2,1}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Therefore, by Theorem 3.1, there exists a positive constant M such that

$$\|u^\varepsilon - u\|_\infty \leq M\varepsilon \qquad \forall \varepsilon \in (0,1).$$

Acknowledgment

The author is grateful to Professor P. Cardaliaguet and to Professor E.R. Jakobsen for fruitful discussions.

References

[1] V.I. Arnold and A. Avez. *Problèmes ergodiques de la mècanique classique.* Gauthiers-Villars, Paris, 1967.

[2] O. Alvarez and M. Bardi. Viscosity solutions methods for singular perturbations in deterministic and stochastic control. SIAM J. Control Optim. **40** (2001), 1159 – 1188.

[3] O. Alvarez and M. Bardi. Ergodicity, stabilization, and singular perturbations for Bellman-Isaacs equation. Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. **204** (2010), n. 960.

[4] M. Arisawa and P.L. Lions, On ergodic stochastic control. Comm. Partial Differential Equations **23** (1998), 2187 – 2217.

[5] M. Bardi and F. Da Lio. On the strong maximum principle for fully nonlinear degenerate elliptic equations. Arch. Math. **73** (1999), 276 – 285.

[6] G. Barles, O. Ley and H. Mitake. Short Time Uniqueness Results for Solutions of Nonlocal and Non-monotone Geometric Equations. arXiv:1005.5597.

[7] G. Barles and E.R. Jakobsen. Error bounds for monotone approximation schemes for parabolic Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equations. Math. Comp. **76** (2007) 1861 – 1893.

[8] G. Barles and P. Souganidis. Space-time periodic solutions and long-time behavior of solutions to quasi-linear parabolic equations. Siam J. Math. Anal. **32** (2001) 1311–1323.

[9] A. Bensoussan, J.L. Lions and G. Papanicolaou. *Asymptotic Analysis for periodic Structures*. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1978.

[10] L. Caffarelli and P. Souganidis. Rates of convergence for the homogenization of fully nonlinear uniformly elliptic pde in random media. Invent. Math. **180** (2010), 301 – 360.

[11] L. Caffarelli, P. Souganidis and L. Wang. Homogenization of fully nonlinear, uniformly elliptic and parabolic partial differential equations in stationary ergodic media. Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **58** (2005), 319 – 361.

[12] F. Camilli, A. Cesaroni and C. Marchi. Homogenization and vanishing viscosity in fully nonlinear elliptic equations: rate of convergence estimates. Adv. Nonlinear Stud. **11** (2011), 405 – 428.

[13] F. Camilli and C. Marchi. Rates of convergence in periodic homogenization of fully nonlinear uniformly elliptic PDEs. Nonlinearity **22** (2009), 1481 – 1498.

[14] I. Capuzzo Dolcetta and H. Ishii. On the rate of convergence in homogenization of Hamilton-Jacobi equations. Indiana Univ. Math. J. **50** (2001), 1113 – 1129.

[15] I.P. Cornfeld, S.V. Fomin and Y.G. Sinai. *Ergodic theory.* Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1982.

[16] H. Dong and N.V. Krylov. The rate of convergence of finite-difference approximations for parabolic Bellman equations with Lipschitz coefficients in cylindrical domains. Appl. Math. Optim. **56** (2007), 37 – 66.

[17] L. Evans. Periodic homogenisation of certain fully nonlinear partial differential equations Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A **120** (1992), 245 – 265.

[18] D. Gilbarg and N.S. Trudinger *Elliptic Partial Differential Equations of Second Order.* Springer, Berlin 1983. Second edition.

[19] E.R. Jakobsen and C.A. Georgelin. Continuous dependence results for non-linear Neumann type boundary value problems. J. Differential Equations **245** (2008), 2368 – 2396.

[20] E.R. Jakobsen and K.H. Karlsen. Continuous dependence estimates for viscosity solutions of fully nonlinear degenerate parabolic equations. J. Differential Equations **183** (2002), 497 – 525.

[21] V.V. Jikov, S.M. Kozlov and O.A. Oleinik. *Homogenization of Differential Operators and Integral Functionals*. Springer, Berlin, 1994.

[22] O.A. Ladyzenskaja and N.N. Ural'tseva. Linear and quasilinear elliptic equations. *Linear and quasilinear elliptic equations.* Academic Press, New York, 1968.

[23] C. Marchi. Continuous dependence estimates for the ergodic problem of Bellman-Isaacs operators via the parabolic Cauchy problem. ESAIM Control Optim. Calc. Var. **18** (2012), 954 – 968.

[24] M.V. Safonov. On the classical solution of nonlinear elliptic equations of second-order. Math. USSR-Izv. **33** (1989), 597 – 612. (Engl. transl. of Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR Ser. Mat. **52** (1988)).

[25] N.S. Trudinger. Comparison principles and pointwise estimates for viscosity solutions of nonlinear elliptic equations. Rev. Mat. Iberoamericana **4** (1988), 453 – 468.

[26] V.V. Yurinski. Averaging of symmetric diffusion in a random media. Sibirsk. Mat. Zh. **27** (1986), 167 – 180; Engl. transl. Siberian Math. J. **27** (1986), 603 – 613.